UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2636th MEETING: 12 DECEMBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2636)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 6 December 1985 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17671)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2636th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 12 December 1985, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Léandre BASSOLE (Burkina Faso).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2636)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. Letter dated 6 December 1985 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17671).

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 6 December 1985 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17671)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at earlier meetings [*2633rd and 2634th meetings*], I invite the representative of Nicaragua to take a place at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Costa Rica, Cuba, Honduras, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Chamorro Mora (Nicaragua) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Berrocal Soto (Costa Rica), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Herrera Cáceres (Honduras), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Moya Palencia (Mexico), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Zimbabwe in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite him to participate in the debate, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now resume consideration of the item on its agenda.

4. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): You already know, Sir, my deep feelings of friendship and fraternity for you, and I might have refrained from congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month if I were not persuaded that your outstanding qualities of dedication, wisdom, perseverance and objectivity are the very qualities that the Council may well need for the guidance of its work this month. We wish you success and take the opportunity to pay a tribute to the important contribution that both you personally and your delegation have made to the Council during the period in which you have represented Africa and your country, Burkina Faso, whose special relationship with the Democratic Republic of Madagascar I am pleased to emphasize.

5. I also wish to associate my delegation with the thanks that you have expressed, on behalf of the Council, to Mr. Richard Woolcott, representative of Australia, our neighbour from across the seas, for the remarkable way in which he conducted our proceedings last month. We particularly appreciated his vigilance, his persistence and his spirit of initiative whenever the issue was to restore to the Council its proper role in the maintenance of international peace and security, and I am sure that the Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar will have the opportunity to discuss this with the authorities concerned during his present official visit to Australia.

6. When we consider the situation in Central America and the bilateral disputes whose persistence makes the search for a comprehensive solution even more difficult, we always find ourselves referring to the Contadora spirit, not to escape responsibility, but because the purposes and principles set out in the Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America are basically the same as those of the Charter of the United Nations. Without losing sight of the fact that we are seeking a comprehen-

sive agreement, we would point out that in the political and security matters, which fall within the Council's competence, implementing the Contadora Act should make it possible to establish harmonious relations between the countries of the region, guaranteed, and even strengthened, by a system of regional security.

7. There is nothing original in that analysis, but it enabled the Council to adopt unanimously resolutions 530 (1983) and 562 (1985). The Council's position is therefore quite clear with respect to the right of Nicaragua and all the other countries of the region to live in peace and security, free from all outside interference; their right freely to determine their own form of government and to choose their own economic, political and social systems, without foreign interference or constraints or restrictions of any kind; the duty of the States concerned, inside and outside the region, to resolve their differences by means of frank and constructive dialogue; non-recourse to economic, political or any other measures to force another State to accept any limitations on the exercise of its sovereign rights; and the obligation of all States to refrain in their dealings with the States of the region from taking, supporting or encouraging political, economic or military measures of any kind likely to be prejudicial to the Contadora Group's peace objectives.

8. In confirmation of what I have just said, I wish to emphasize the following five elements among the political and security objectives of the Contadora Act: first, control and reduction of armaments and troop numbers; secondly, elimination of intimidation; thirdly, elimination of all forms of foreign military presence; fourthly, an end to all support for irregular forces; and fifthly, elimination of terrorism, subversion and sabotage.

9. Agreements cannot be arrived at by accident, and since the United Nations—and the Security Council in particular—has undertaken to support the Contadora Group, it is our duty individually and collectively to ensure that the rights of States in the region are respected, that the obligations of States inside and outside the region are scrupulously honoured and that the objectives of the Contadora Act are achieved. This is not an easy task, because we must be able to bank on the sincere co-operation of interested States, and until that is forthcoming we shall unfortunately have to resign ourselves to a recrudescence and an escalation of tension the effects of which are only too foreseeable, that is to say, generalized insecurity and the failure of the Contadora efforts with all that that entails for international peace and security.

10. We might be charged with unnecessary pessimism. But I have read once again the statement made by my delegation in the Council on 31 March 1982 [*2343rd meeting*], shortly after the former President of Mexico, Mr. José López Portillo, had launched his initiative, and I noted with regret that, in spite of the continuing negotiations, in spite of international support for the Contadora Group, in spite of the definite results achieved by the Group—most recently in Cartagena on 13 September last—in spite of the setting up of the Lima Support Group, the situation in the region, in particular in Nicaragua, remains unchanged. Charges and countercharges continue; prejudice and bias have not been removed; and dialogue is drowning in recrimination and pre-conditions which are known beforehand to be unacceptable. In point of fact, we have allowed ourselves to be enclosed within a special kind of logic according to which bilateral disputes should be settled within the framework of any future Contadora agreement while the very deepening of these disputes makes the conclusion of an agreement ever more unlikely, particularly in a context of increasingly tense ideological confrontation.

11. Far be it from us to discourage or disavow the Contadora Group. But the Council must bear in mind its responsibilities under Chapter VI of the Charter. It is my impression that Nicaragua, in requesting an urgent convening of the Council, was invoking Article 35 of the Charter. If this impression is correct, the Council can act under Article 34, on the understanding that my delegation is interpreting paragraph 2 of Article 36, which lays down that "The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties", as susceptible to application to procedures which might be advocated by the Contadora Group. Article 38 gives the Council another means of intervention. My delegation feels that recourse to the various provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter is not incompatible with Chapter VIII, which relates to regional arrangements, particularly if we refer to paragraph 4 of Article 52, which reads: "This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35."

12. My delegation realizes, however, that texts, whatever authority they may possess, will have no effect if the parties to whom they are addressed do not agree to show a minimum of political will, which presupposes the acceptance of a policy that would lead to normalization. We may have different views as to procedure, but the important thing is our wish to give the Council a leading role, and not just a supporting role, in promoting a political and negotiated solution in Central America. Our confidence in the Contadora Group is intact, because its initiative has served and continues to serve as a test of the good faith of the various parties and of their willingness to honour their obligations under the Charter and to work towards the establishment in the region of a system of political relations based on mutual respect and the sovereign equality of States. But if the deadlock is not broken, if there is an increase in armed clashes and the situation in Central America continues to deteriorate, the Council will have to take all the necessary steps to shoulder its responsibilities.

13. It is in that spirit that we have analysed the information the Acting Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, Mr. Victor Hugo Tinoco, provided us with last Tuesday afternoon [*2633rd meeting*], and we should like to take this opportunity to repeat to the delegation of Nicaragua our full and wholehearted solidarity with the Nicaraguan cause in international bodies and within the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

14. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Honduras. I invite

him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

15. Mr. HERRERA CACERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the representative of Australia, who presided over the work of the Council very successfully, objectively and wisely in the course of the previous month and to extend to you, Sir, our appreciation of your diplomatic skills which, we hope, will lead to a beneficial development in the work of the Council this month. We also wish to thank the Security Council for its decision to allow us to take part in the discussion of the question on its agenda, given that statements and concepts of the Acting Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua in his intervention the day before yesterday have had a particular impact on the interests of Honduras as a State Member of the Organization.

16. Prior to these meetings, the Security Council had the sagacity, through you, Mr. President, to convene the countries of the subregion in order to hear information on the situation in Central America and the peace negotiating process. As you have so well expressed it in mentioning the reasons for convening us, the Council is aware of the fact that in this case we are dealing with an internal Nicaraguan problem which, however, cannot be divorced from the regional context approach.

17. Indeed, we concur in that assessment by the Security Council. That is also why the Council, in its formal meetings, must hear first all the parties directly concerned in a regional conflict, in order not to be used for the exclusive purposes of the policy of a given Government, and also in order to take its decisions on the basis of the greatest awareness of the cause and the objective.

18. We all seem to agree that the time has come to stop using euphemisms. That is why we must clearly identify, once and for all, the purposes of the Sandinist Government in halting the Contadora negotiating process and continuing to disregard the internal Central American causes of the conflict, trying to make them out to be foreign factors.

19. The most recent examples of progress in the Contadora negotiating process are the final draft of the Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America of September 1985 and the results of the last meeting of plenipotentiaries, held at Panama City from 19 to 21 November.

20. Thus, we have a specific definition of the two issues on the settlement of which the achievement of a peaceful, comprehensive and regional solution to the Central American problem depends. These issues are, on the one hand, the arms race in Nicaragua, the excessive number of weapons in Nicaragua's arsenal and the excessive number of its armed forces and, on the other hand, the frequent deterrent international military manoeuvres which Honduras has had to undertake as a countermeasure. Since commitments already exist on the political or democratic subjects and on national reconciliation in each country, if agreement were to be reached on these two last issues, that would truly promote a climate of détente in Central America as a whole.

21. But the Sandinist Government has shown, by deeds, its opposition to such an agreement, because it is not interested in an early end to the conflict in Central America. The Sandinists seem to believe that their ideological and party interests are more important than the needs of the other peoples of Central America. That is why they have blocked the final, fundamental part of the peace negotiations. That is why they are trying to involve this Organization in matters that have been recognized as being within regional, Latin American jurisdiction. That is also why they have made the Contadora Group suspend the negotiating process for five months. In other words, it appears that the Government of Nicaragua has been trying for almost half a year to bury Contadora alive, and the other Central Americans can only hope that there is enough oxygen left so that they can disinter it before it is too late.

22. That action by the Nicaraguan Government goes hand in hand with the link it is trying to establish between a comprehensive regional solution in Central America and a bilateral agreement between Nicaragua and the United States.

23. Let us be well aware that, while in other regions there is emphasis on and condemnation of actions aimed at thwarting the conclusion of negotiated agreements in southern Africa, Nicaragua is frustrating those efforts to achieve understanding in Central America; while in regard to Africa there is condemnation of the linkage of the solution to African problems with the presence of foreign military forces, Nicaragua is asking for support for its thesis that the conflict in Central America should be linked with the support given by a country from outside the region to the Nicaraguan opposition. It is obvious—and it will be so construed—that when the same universal principles are at stake, a difference in treatment cannot be accepted.

24. Honduras is ready to conclude negotiations on pending questions, but it will never be prepared to subordinate a regional agreement in Central America to a bilateral agreement which Nicaragua, basing itself on its military supremacy in Central America, is trying to conclude with the United States. Honduras leaves it to the concerned parties to make the sovereign decision about when circumstances will make possible the conclusion of such bilateral agreements.

25. It is not possible, however, to disregard the statement made on Tuesday by the Nicaraguan representative that the United States Government also opposes an agreement among the Central Americans. For the sole purpose of bringing out the truth, as confirmed in documents, we have once again looked at the verbatim record of the General Assembly meeting of 22 November 1985 on the situation in Central America, when the representative of the United States said, "My Government has made clear repeatedly, in public and in private, that we will abide by any agreement the Central Americans reach".[1] Since that is the United States position, and if the

other countries with ideological interests and links with Nicaragua show the same tendency, this argument cannot be used to justify opposition to the idea that Central America alone should make its own decisions.

26. The Nicaraguan Government spoke, through the voice of its Acting Minister for External Relations, about the use of Honduran territory for activities by Nicaraguan insurgents. Apart from the fact that the civil war in Nicaragua is being fought on its own territory, one may well ask whether it is not perhaps a contradiction to hold Honduras responsible for an alleged lack of control over regions that are practically inaccessible to the Honduran army when Nicaragua, for its part, with an army and armaments that are more than five times greater than those of Honduras, is unable to control within its own territory either the alleged raids from Honduras or the actual raids that are prepared and carried out in Nicaragua itself.

27. These allegations against my country show the absolute absurdity of implying that Honduras is also responsible for the existence of the Marxist-Leninist guerrillas in El Salvador, because they, too, are mobilized along our borders and receive through Honduran territory the weapons that are sent them clandestinely by the Sandinist Government.

28. It is said, with all the "force and responsibility" inherent in what the Acting Minister of Nicaragua himself has described as "confidential sources," that the insurgents are being trained in Honduras in the handling of SAM-7 rockets. What a categorical manner, and what objective sources have been produced to substantiate that charge!

29. But what has not been said, and what is contained not only in excerpts from newspapers but also in official documents, is that Honduras has expelled leaders of the Miskito uprising because of their warlike statements made from our territory, and that on 17 October of this year an aircraft carrying 40 tons of humanitarian aid to the Nicaraguan insurgents was stopped by our authorities and returned to its country of origin with a clear statement with regard to the respect the rule of law receives in Honduras.

30. The alleged truth of the Nicaraguan allegations that have been made and may be made in the future deserves examination, and for that purpose the final version of the Contadora Act provides, among its mechanisms for execution and follow-up, for a Verification and Control Commission for Security Matters, one of whose functions is to undertake such examination.

31. In that connection the joint political communiqué on political dialogue and economic co-operation between the States members of the European Community, Spain and Portugal and the States of Central America and of the Contadora Group [*S/17681, annex II*], issued at the ministerial conference held in Luxembourg on 11 and 12 November, stated:

> "The States members of the European Community, Spain and Portugal reiterate their willingness to support, to the extent that they are able and if so requested, the action of the States with responsibility for implementing the terms of the Contadora Act and, in particular, to contribute to the implementing and follow-up mechanisms."

Thus, if mechanisms have been envisaged and if there are responsible, impartial States willing to participate, why does Nicaragua insist on frustrating the final negotiation of that Act? To those reasons I have already mentioned, we must add that the Nicaraguan Government does not accept the mechanisms of verification and control because they would not merely hear Nicaragua's claims and allegations against neighbouring States but would have to hear, on an equal footing, the claims or allegations any other Central American State might bring against Nicaragua. Furthermore, the Nicaraguan Government attempts to disregard commitments on political matters, as contained in the Act, and consequently it does not want any implementation or follow-up of such commitments since that would also entail an *ad hoc* committee for the evaluation and follow-up of commitments in the areas of national reconciliation, human rights and electoral processes.

32. Now, we want to believe that there is no veiled threat in what the Nicaragauan representative stated in the Council the day before yesterday with regard to that régime's greater support for subversion in neighbouring countries, and particularly with regard to Honduras, when he spoke of "any sort of insurgency situation that may arise inside Honduras" [*see 2633rd meeting, para. 36*].

33. We do not fear such threats because we are experiencing a process of true democracy in Honduras, and that is and will be our best bulwark against subversion. We do wish to recall, however, that the Charter of the United Nations prohibits not only the use of force but also the threat of use of force, and that the statement made the day before yesterday, as well as other and more direct statements made on previous occasions by the representative of the Nicaraguan Government, show the extent of its respect for international law and for the norms of peaceful coexistence. Such threats are a flagrant violation of the provisions of the Charter, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and other relevant instruments.

34. In spite of the unbelievable contradictions of the attitudes to which we have referred, we do not quite understand why the Nicaraguan Government does not endeavour to undertake a more serious analysis for peace, one that is less ideologically committed to expansionism.

35. All the facts mentioned are obvious and easily verifiable. Thus, it would be very difficult to explain a failure by the members of the Council, and eventually the General Assembly, to consider them.

36. We believe that the General Assembly, as well as this body that bears primary responsibility for the mainte-

nance of international peace and security, cannot overlook the implications of decisions taken here on the precarious situation in Central America or ignore the ways in which those decisions may contribute to the regional negotiating process of Contadora, which has been expressly supported by the heads of State or Government of nearly all States and which all States members of the Organization of American States (OAS), with the sole exception of Nicaragua, have supported and encouraged in a virtually unanimous vote in order to promote that process unconditionally and without restrictions. Nor can we fail to consider the harm we would be doing the morale of the Central American subregion if we were to replace the expected consideration of the question in a regional context with an approach favouring only one of the parties to the conflict.

37. But, more than addressing each representative of each State in particular, as Members of this Organization we wish to recall the collective responsibility we bear when we act as a United Nations body and recall that this institution is a body in which ideologies can confront each other within the broad framework of our fundamental unity for peace. Therefore, it is not to be expected that bodies merely reflect the ideological confrontation among their members and thus lose sight of the broader framework of our fundamental unity for peace, in this case peace in Central America.

38. We could probably speak today of a Central American formula by analogy with the one that was once known as the Peking formula, which stated the role expected of organs when the late Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjöld, explained that in fulfilling his mission to try to reduce international tension anywhere in the world the Secretary-General does not work for any nation, nor even for a majority of nations, as expressed in a vote of the General Assembly, but rather in accordance with his constitutional responsibility in relation to the general purposes established in the Charter.

39. Mr. Hammarskjöld also said that the United Nations is "an organization created not to lead us to heaven but rather to save us from hell". Let us trust that we will not be induced to move in the opposite direction.

40. Honduras trusts that wisdom and common sense will prevail and that the present Nicaraguan Government will reconsider and finally share the legitimate expectation of the majority of Central Americans that they will decide for themselves the best paths to peace and co-operation for the greater nation, the Central American nation.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

42. Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me pleasure on behalf of my delegation to convey to you, Sir, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are confident that your wisdom and well-known personal qualities will ensure that you will lead the Council's deliberations to the best possible conclusion. In this regard my delegation would like to pay a tribute to the excellent relations that bind our two peoples and our two countries. I also wish to express our thanks to your predecessor, the President of the Security Council for last month, on the exemplary manner in which he conducted the business of the Council.

43. We all listened very attentively to the statement made by the Acting Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua to the Council the day before yesterday [*2633rd meeting*], in which he referred to the escalation by the mercenary bands of their aggressive acts against Nicaragua with the support of the United States Administration. That escalation was manifested in the downing of a Nicaraguan air force helicopter, an incident that took the lives of many innocent people who fell victims to an infamous act of terrorism.

44. The fact that those mercenary bands were provided with such sophisticated weapons constitutes a threat to peace and security in the Central American region and an act of aggression against the sovereignty of a Member State of the United Nations. Undoubtedly it also leaves civilian aircraft in the region open to the danger of being easy targets for aggressive acts by those terrorist bands. Furthermore it constitutes a grave precedent which, if condoned by the world, would be repeated in many regions, in particular against the small nations that refuse imperialist hegemony and domination.

45. It is to be regretted that that terrorist act of aggression supported by the imperialist Powers comes at a time when the General Assembly has at its current session condemned all forms of terrorism, whatever the origin. It also comes at a time when the General Assembly is considering the situation in Central America, as part of an attempt by the international community to support the efforts made by the Contadora Group and the other countries concerned to reach just and peacefully negotiated solutions of the problems of the region. That act of aggression, supported by foreign Powers, comes as yet another proof of the lack of desire on the part of those Powers to reach a just and negotiated peaceful solution of the problems of the region. It constitutes another obstacle to the efforts made by the Contadora Group and the international community to contribute to the just solution of the problems of Central America.

46. We have all heard the Acting Foreign Minister of Nicaragua speaking of his country's response to the efforts of the Contadora Group to reach a just, negotiated solution for the problems of Central America and his country's readiness to resume dialogue with the United States Administration, which unilaterally suspended it. We believe Nicaragua is sincere in its efforts to solve the problems of the region. It has put forward many a proof and many an initiative in this regard; we need not list them.

47. The flagrant intervention by the United States Administration in Central America, which has been manifested in the incidents to which Nicaragua has been subjected since the eruption of the war of the mercenaries against the revolution in 1981, is deplorable and is condemned by all international laws and norms. It falls within

the category of attempts to impose hegemony and domination on small nations struggling for their freedom and dignity against the colonialist Powers. Those Powers persist in their lack of respect for the right of those peoples to choose their own political, social and economic systems.

48. The portrayal of the mercenary bands fighting against the legitimate revolution in Nicaragua as fighters for democracy is undoubtedly an attempt to find pretexts for the provision of support and assistance to those bands. Such support violates the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. It is also yet another attempt to undermine the provisions of international law, and as such it must be vigorously condemned. The necessity of respect for the sovereignty of States and the right and freedom of peoples to choose their own régimes, as well as for their right to self-determination, must be emphasized.

49. What is referred to as the Cuban presence in Nicaragua and the use of it as a pretext to justify intervention in the affairs of Central America and against Nicaragua in particular is a legitimate presence in accordance with an agreement between the two parties concerned, which are both sovereign States. It amounts to no more than using the help of some experts and advisers, as is the sovereign right of any State. It is no surprise to us that the very same pretext is used by the racist régime of South Africa to escalate its acts of aggression against Angola.

50. We believe that the foreign involvement and interference, in total disregard of the provisions of international law and the principles of the Charter, in an attempt to undermine the revolutionary system in Nicaragua is quite clear and does not have to be proved.

51. Suffice it, in this regard, to refer to a study in the publication *The Link* in November 1985 under the heading "U.S.-Israeli-Central American Connection", written by Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, a professor of psychology at Haifa University, in occupied Palestine. He has written a book on Israel's relations with States of the third world, in which he pointed out Israel's involvement and interference as an agent of the United States in the affairs of Central America by providing military assistance, funds and training for the contra bands fighting against the Sandinist revolution in Nicaragua.

52. The study points out that since Shimon Peres became Prime Minister, in the autumn of 1984, Israeli exports of arms to the contras have increased tenfold. It states, "When the CIA was setting up the contra organization in 1981, the Mossad was also there, carrying out the training and support for the first units."* The study also points out that when the United States was not able to support the contras officially and directly it was replaced by other States, among which was Israel. It says:

> "According to one account the United States demanded overt and covert Israeli support for U.S. activities against the Sandinist Government. In return, the United States would bankroll Israeli activities in other parts of the third world."*

53. I believe these quotations are sufficient to clarify some of the aspects of the foreign involvement aimed at the elimination of the revolutionary system of Nicaragua and the destabilization of Central America and Latin America. It is a classic example of the various forms of interference and aggression against peoples and régimes struggling against racist and colonialist domination in all parts of the world.

54. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Costa Rica. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

55. Mr. BERROCAL SOTO (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica congratulates you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. I would like to thank you publicly for having been so kind as to invite me to your office so that you could hear the views of Costa Rica on the critical situation in Central America and on the best way of arriving at a single consensus solution in the General Assembly. As you know, we came to your office with words of peace and openness to dialogue. I would also like to express my delegation's appreciation to last month's President, the representative of Australia, for his valuable contribution to the work of the Security Council in November.

56. I should like first of all to reaffirm before the Council the attitude that we manifested in our working meeting with the President. For historical reasons Costa Rica, in the context of the crisis in Central America, is a factor for peace. Our position could not be otherwise as a country that has made dialogue and tolerance the basic and essential principle of its national conduct and in its relations with other peoples and nations of the world.

57. I have been compelled to appear before the Security Council because of a false assertion by the Acting Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua. The delegation of Costa Rica set forth with clarity its views on the critical situation in Central America in the statement we made in the General Assembly on 25 November. At that time we made it crystal-clear that Costa Rica is in favour of peace in Central America. This is our sole national position, and I repeat it emphatically in this supreme organ of the United Nations.

58. The representative of Nicaragua has made a false assertion about Costa Rica. I take it that his words are part of a new international political strategy, the clearest sign of which is the recent hardening of political and military positions in Managua. In this context, the Sandinist authorities repeat the false assertion that "anti-Sandinist counter-revolutionary bands" are operating on the territory of Costa Rica. I should like to quote from the statement made by Mr. Tinoco. He said:

> "In May the United States Congress, in yet another act of defiance of the most fundamental norms govern-

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

ing international relations, approved the appropriation of $27 million to finance activities aimed at overthrowing the legitimate Government of my country. That humanitarian aid, as it was euphemistically described in order to conceal the real purpose of this act, was in fact intended to continue uninterrupted the flow of military supplies to the counter-revolutionary bands which, under the control and leadership of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States, are operating from the territory of the neighbouring countries of Honduras and Costa Rica." [*2633rd meeting, para. 7.*]

59. I categorically repudiate that assertion by the Government of Nicaragua and here in the Security Council, as far as Costa Rica is concerned, I denounce the falsehood uttered by the Nicaraguan representative. I regret also that the Sandinist authorities are so obsessive about discovering their enemies, or at least some of them, in Costa Rica. This distortion of the facts prompted them in the past to finance and develop a crude campaign to discredit the international prestige of my country. We thought that that dark stage of our bilateral relations was a thing of the past, and we were at pains to point out, with a certain satisfaction, that in San José the authorities of my country thought that the Government of Nicaragua had finally accepted the undeniable reality and value of our national policy of strict neutrality concerning the civil war in that brother country. We were mistaken. The statements of Mr. Tinoco in the Security Council, those made a few days ago in Caracas by Vice-President Sergio Ramírez and the clear signs of renewed intransigence, internally and externally, from Managua indicate to us that we are witnessing a new qualitative change in the relations between Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

60. Our peasants have a saying: "The evening foreshadows the day". Thus, we are sincerely concerned to see whence comes this unfortunate new day in our relations with Nicaragua. We are ready. Yet we can only deplore the fact that the Sandinist authorities are once again turning to the treacherous weapon of trying to sully the name and the moral and ethical standing of Costa Rica. That we shall not accept either from Mr. Tinoco or from Mr. Ramírez or from the commanders or from any other Sandinist authority. The Nicaraguans will find us here, before the Security Council, and in any other international or regional body or forum. Costa Rica will not take the initiative in a political attack against Nicaragua. My country does not seek and never has sought confrontation with Nicaragua; that is not in any way in keeping with our national interests. We want to live in peace with our neighbours in Central America. We want to establish peaceful and stable standards of coexistence with all the countries of Central America regardless of the ideology of their political or economic system. What we cannot—shall not—accept are false, gratuitous attacks from Nicaragua or from any other country.

61. Costa Ricans live in peace and practise pluralism in our internal relations. We wish also to live in peace in our external relations with the world, at the apex of human development, where pluralism and interdependence are the watchwords of the times. That is the fundamental thrust of our proclamation on permanent, active and unarmed neutrality. That is the fundamental, essential rule of our international policy. Costa Rica again confirms and stresses this before the Security Council, the highest organ of the United Nations.

62. My country has always been open for verification that there are no counter-revolutionary camps on the territory of Costa Rica. We have never prevented missions or commissions from the countries of the Contadora Group—Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela—from visiting and moving freely throughout our national territory, without any restrictions. Moreover, on not a few occasions Costa Rica has requested such verification. Nor do we oppose further efforts by the Contadora Group to that end, if that is the wish of the international community. Furthermore, we invite the Contadora Group to verify that there are no counter-revolutionary camps in Costa Rica and that anti-Sandinist bands do not operate there. My country has absolutely nothing to hide from anyone. The international community knows too that there are no military bases in Costa Rica, either our own or those of other countries, for the simple reason that since 1949 Costa Rica has had no army and no armed forces.

63. An army is prohibited under our political Constitution. My country is the only one in the world which, 37 years ago, proceeded to disarm voluntarily and unilaterally. We have no army and we in Costa Rica do not want to have an army. Thus, we do not hold joint or bilateral military manoeuvres with any other country. If we have no army, how could we possibly hold military manoeuvres or agree to the establishment of military bases? Costa Rica has no air force and no navy. There is not a single piece of heavy artillery in Costa Rica. The only cannon we possess lie rusting and unusable in the National Museum, for they are 40 years old. We possess no armed helicopters. There is not a single tank in Costa Rica, not a single one made in the United States or in the Soviet Union or in any other country. Costa Rica is unarmed; it is as simple as that; it is as genuine and true as that.

64. I assume that is why when Mr. Tinoco referred in his statement to the 1985-1986 edition of *The Military Balance* published by the International Institute for Strategic Studies, in London, he made no reference to Costa Rica. Fortunately, my country does not appear in sophisticated publications on the military balance. For the past 37 years my country has devoted its national budget to education, public health, social security and public welfare.

65. That is why Costa Rica—and here I speak with legitimate pride, with great national pride, with more satisfaction than a commander or a general feels at the kind of military parade of which other countries are so fond and which makes the Sandinist leaders dizzy with delight—has the highest rates in all of Latin America for medical care and social security; that is why there is practically no illiteracy in my country; that is why education is free and compulsory; that is why we in Costa Rica have a standard of living similar to that of the citizens of Western developed countries. In every corner of my country, even the most remote, there is a school and a hospital. What we do not have are barracks, political prisons, islands or other places of confinement for opposition leaders. There is not a single Costa Rican—not a single

one—who has had to go into exile because of his political or religious views. No one is persecuted in my country. Opposition of any ideology is legitimate and enjoys full unrestricted guarantees; there is free access to the communications media; freedom of assembly; freedom to organize and undertake propaganda activities; free access to public places; free access to the organs of political power, which in Costa Rica are authentic, legitimate and freely elected by the citizens, not fraudulently imposed or the result of a military coup.

66. We in Costa Rica are legitimately proud of all these facts, which explain why the representative of the Government of Nicaragua—when it comes to proving his case or citing irrefutable facts to substantiate or document his false charges—must yield to the evidence that he cannot provide the international community with information on the number of tanks, armed helicopters, combat aircraft, guns, heavy artillery or military units possessed by Costa Rica. He cannot do this. The groundlessness of his charges is thus fully proven. That is my country's honest rebuttal before the Security Council and before the United Nations. That is the final, conclusive and absolute argument of Costa Rica. That is our response to Nicaragua. That constitutes our moral and ethical strength within the international community.

67. On 17 November this year, my country's Legislative Assembly, two years after the proclamation by President Luis Alberto Monge of Costa Rica's permanent, active and unarmed neutrality, began work on a bill which would transform that aspiration of the Costa Rican people into the law of the land. In that way, an essential part of our history and national tradition will become the law forever. That sovereign decision by Costa Rica is an act of faith in international law, in the Charter of the United Nations and in the collective security arrangements adopted by the OAS.

68. In the same spirit, Costa Rica has firmly supported the peace negotiations of the Contadora Group. We have said, and we repeat here in the Security Council, that my country is ready to sign, without any reservations, the final Contadora Act.

69. However, Costa Rica's neutrality should not be understood to mean that we are unwilling to stand up for ourselves. My country is fully aware of the grave responsibilities it has assumed with its policy of peace and disarmament in the context of a situation such as that in Central America, which is becoming more critical and polarized with every passing day, both ideologically and militarily. We understand and regard as reasonable and justified the concerns of the other countries of Central America.

70. I wish to set forth calmly and with complete realism some of our objective concerns.

71. An official document circulated during the Contadora negotiations said:

> "The National Guard of Somoza numbered 7,800 men. Today, in its place, there is an army of 50,000 men and a militia 100,000 strong, both men and women. The Nicaraguan Army has no fewer than 100 Soviet T-54 and T-55 medium tanks, 20 PT-76 amphibious tanks and 120 other armoured vehicles. It also possesses 120 anti-aircraft guns, 700 SAM-7 rocket launchers, 10 MI-8 helicopters and 6 AN-2 armed transport aircraft. Military service is compulsory for all men over 17 years of age."

72. Even though recent reports speak of 350 tanks and 30 sophisticated combat helicopters, my delegation has no objection to Mr. Tinoco's increasing or reducing those figures. I imagine that he has readily to hand the latest data on Nicaragua from the International Institute for Strategic Studies, in London, which it would be important for him or any other Sandinist representative to inform the Council about. The objective fact is that the glaring and spectacular disproportion of military forces is a potential danger to Costa Rica's national security, integrity and sovereignty. There are different angles to all problems, and for us in Costa Rica the arms race in Central America, in all its manifestations, is a matter of extreme gravity and concern. The very fact that the Security Council is meeting is clear evidence of that reality as well as of the degree of violence and sophistication of the civil war now going on in Nicaragua.

73. Of course, the struggle in Central America is for peace, but it is fundamentally and essentially a struggle for democracy and economic and social development, in freedom.

74. In the Contadora Act, the chapters dealing with the necessary commitments in matters of security, armaments and military strength are as important as those concerning political matters. Without freedom and democracy, there will never be peace in Central America. Without national reconciliation in the countries in a state of civil war there will be no peace in our region. The people of Central America wish to express themselves freely and to choose their leaders by electoral processes that are honest and authentic. For Costa Rica it is a matter of fundamental importance that disarmament be carried out and that military manoeuvres cease. Equally important to my country is the establishment of independent electoral bodies and the guaranteeing of free access by all currents of public opinion and all ideological persuasions to honest, regular electoral processes, based on the full observance of civil rights. Democracy is a régime of political parties. Democracy is freedom of the press. Democracy is trade union freedom. Democracy is absolute respect for human rights. We Costa Ricans will never tire of saying that the thousands and thousands of Central Americans who have died in the past few decades have not done so simply to exchange Fascist, totalitarian dictatorships of the right for communist, totalitarian dictatorships of the left. Nor can militarism be the destiny of Central America.

75. The immense peace effort and its clear orientation, which leaves no room for false interpretations, towards the principles of representative democracy and political freedom must be complemented by a realistic, coherent, pragmatic and effective programme of economic development and a change in social structures in our region.

76. While they desire peace, the peoples of Central America also want to overcome poverty and underdevelopment. The banner of social justice is therefore a legitimate banner in Central America—social justice, but with freedom; revolution and a change of structures, but within democracy.

77. Therefore, Costa Rica attaches the greatest importance to chapter IV of the Contadora Act, which refers to commitments regarding economic and social matters. They include an undertaking to reactivate, perfect and restructure the process of regional economic integration and give new life to the Central American Common Market, thus transforming it into one of the central objectives of the present day in Central America. That is undoubtedly an economic objective, but it will at the same time fall directly and in a positive manner within the process of peace-making and the reduction of political tensions between the five countries.

78. That is why in Costa Rica's statement in the General Assembly we pointed out the value of the international community's asking the Secretary-General to formulate and carry out as soon as possible—in co-operation with bodies within the United Nations system, and particularly the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean and the United Nations Development Programme—a plan for economic and social co-operation in Central America. In Costa Rica's view, such a programme would be welcomed by all the Governments of the region. It would mean moving from rhetoric to action; it would mean putting into practice the essential principles of the Charter. Therefore, we reiterate this initiative of Costa Rica here in the Security Council.

79. There is still time to avert a catastrophe in Central America. Costa Rica is fully aware that we are going through difficult and delicate times. Nevertheless, my country is calm. We unreservedly support the peace efforts of the Contadora Group. Similarly, we have welcomed with great satisfaction and encouraged the support efforts now being made by a group of friendly, brother countries; Argentina, Peru, Uruguay and Brazil. Therefore, convinced of the value of our case and secure in the justice and rationality of the historical path that our people has chosen—without an army, unarmed, neutral in the military conflict, wishing to live in peace with all our neighbours—my country and its leaders will continue to work diligently for peace and a negotiated political solution of the crisis in Central America. We shall not yield in that endeavour. It is our duty. Costa Rica is in favour of peace, and we shall continue to fight for peace in Central America.

80. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Zimbabwe. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

81. Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Allow me first of all to extend my congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. My delegation is confident that your wide diplomatic experience and tested wisdom will enable the Council to execute its tasks with great efficacy. I also wish to congratulate your predecessor, the representative of Australia, for the able manner in which he discharged his responsibilities during the month of November.

82. Barely two weeks ago I had occasion to address the General Assembly, at the 91st meeting of the fortieth session, on the views of my Government regarding the situation in Central America. I had no idea then that I would also be addressing this body on the same subject so soon. Not that I thought the subject unimportant; my very participation in the Assembly debate is evidence enough to the contrary. Nor was it that I foresaw quick fixes to the problems of Central America. It was, rather, that I believed in the worth of the Organization, that it counted for something, that its moral authority was universally recognized, and that, therefore, its pronouncements, an expression of the conscience of mankind in general, would not for long go unheeded.

83. True, words are the tools of our trade as diplomats. It has, however, always been my belief that we use words to influence the situation on the ground. What a great pity if these tools of our trade should also become the sole result of our business.

84. The Council has been convened to discuss the qualitative escalation of the conflict in Central America. For the first time in the history of the Western hemisphere, murderous weaponry—epitomized in this instance by SAM-7 surface-to-air missiles which were used by contras to down a Nicaraguan helicopter and kill 14 government soldiers on 3 December this year—has been supplied to irregular forces. It has been emphasized that the United States Government alone has both the motive and the opportunity to make these missiles available, there being no other country in the hemisphere with similar motives possessing them.

85. While this is not the first time that evidence of United States aggression against Nicaragua has been brought before the Council, we still hold this charge to be extremely serious. It shows the lengths—or is it the depths?—to which the United States Government is prepared to go in its war of aggression against the small country of Nicaragua. Nor do we need to read between the lines to decipher the real purpose of United States activity in Central America. Thus on 2 December 1985 the United States Secretary of State, George Shultz, said that the United States Government would continue "indefinitely" to support the contra forces, which it created and armed and which it finances and directs, even if the Central American countries were to conclude a peace treaty.

86. We are enjoined to ask: What are the United States Government's war aims in Central America?

87. Surely, as the foremost military power in the world today the United States cannot believe that its security is jeopardized by small, struggling Nicaragua, which would, if conditions permitted, ideally allocate all its budgetary resources to economic reconstruction and to other bread-and-butter issues rather than guns and other implements of death. Is it then the security of Nicaragua's neighbours

that the United States fights to preserve? If this were so, how can it then be that Mr. Shultz says that the war would continue even if all the Central American States were to conclude a peace treaty with Nicaragua?

88. From its very inception the Government of Nicaragua endeavoured to pursue democracy at home and friendly relations abroad. Responding to one of Washington's earliest demands and also to its own wish to base its rule on a democratic foundation, the Government of Nicaragua held elections on 4 November 1984, to which international observers, including my own predecessor, were invited. The elections were regarded as free and fair—in the circumstances—by all who came to observe them, except, of course, by the United States. It seems for the United States that the only free and fair elections in Nicaragua would be those in which the Sandinists lost. And the very conditions the United States cited as the reasons why it regarded the elections as unfree and unfair were of its own making: the contras and their destabilization of Nicaragua.

89. Arming itself now with this view and clothing itself in the mantle of champion of democracy, the United States poured money and *matériel* into the coffers of the contras, trained them and directed them with one objective in mind: the overthrow of the Government of Nicaragua. A propaganda war was unleashed against Nicaragua, pamphlets on dirty tricks were drawn up by the CIA for use by the bandits, Nicaragua's harbours were mined and, ultimately, an economic embargo was imposed.

90. That imposition of sanctions against Nicaragua led us in southern Africa to question what was meant by the word "truth". What shall we say to this same American Republic which in the same sentence refuses to impose sanctions on South Africa because they do not work but imposes them on Nicaragua because they do, defends both actions in the name of democracy and arrogates to itself the role of keeper of universal truths? Or is truth merely to be equated with power? In other words, truth is like a piece of red-hot metal: he who wields the heaviest hammer forges the truest truth.

91. Although mandatory sanctions against South Africa would be imposed legally, with the full moral authority of the international community and in keeping with measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, the United States is opposed to these lawful sanctions; but against Nicaragua, in which case they are illegal, unilateral and condemned by the entire international community, including the United States' own allies, the United States has no qualms. What, then, has happened to the oft-stated position that sanctions do not work? Or is it, again, that he who wields the heaviest hammer forges the truest truth?

92. The Charter proscribes the use of force in international relations and exhorts all nations to settle their disputes through peaceful means. This the Government of Nicaragua has endeavoured to do. On the multilateral front they have sought to use the forums provided by the United Nations, the OAS and the Contadora process. These multilateral talks were complemented by the bilateral Manzanillo talks. That the United States was less than fully committed to a peaceful settlement of the Central American crisis was shown by the way it handled the talks in all these forums. When it realized how far Nicaragua was willing to go in the pursuit of peace, it walked out of the Manzanillo talks last January on the grounds that the Managua Government should talk to the contras. How can the legs stop walking without having the head tell them to do so? Is it not that if you want the legs to stop walking you must address the head that instructs them? Even if the contras and the Nicaraguans were to agree on something, who in this Chamber today believes that hostilities would end if Washington took a dim view of that agreement?

93. No, we all know that hostilities would not end. Washington is the creator, the quartermaster and the director of the contras. They are nothing short of a mercenary army for which it has appropriated at least $27 million for what it terms "humanitarian" aid. How "humanitarian" that aid is can be seen from the fact that even United States journalists, compelled by common courtesy towards the proper use of language, have always used the word in inverted commas. It is this humanitarian aid—which an official of the United States Department of State, as quoted by the *Los Angeles Times* of 5 December 1985, said "would now include trucks, helicopters and even airplanes and shift away from such things as medicine, clothing and food"—which has been used to down a Nicaraguan helicopter and kill 14 Nicaraguan soldiers, and about which United States Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Elliot Abrams, proudly proclaimed the following in *The New York Times* of 25 November 1985: "the purpose of our aid is to permit people who are fighting on our side to use more violence". Indeed the "humanitarian" commitment to the contras has resulted, as intended, in the use of violence against the peace-loving people of Nicaragua.

94. We seem to have entered the world of "newspeak", the world of terrorized terrorists, aggressed aggressors, humanitarian guns and ammunition and "big brother"—or is it "big uncle". Nicaragua the aggressed, Nicaragua the desperate, fighting a last-ditch battle to maintain its independence and sovereignty, is labelled an expansionist aggressor that threatens not only its immediate neighbours but the mighty United States itself. Yes, he who wields the heaviest hammer forges the truest truth.

95. We understand what it means to be weak. As we see yet another small country cornered in this way, our hearts go out to it. We do not presume to arrogate to ourselves the mantle of conscience of mankind. Nor do we deign to foist that role on anybody else. Yet, as we thus fall victim to great-Power aggression one after the other, we small countries may do well to harken to the words of the English poet John Donne:

> "No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; . . . any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee".

96. How can Nicaragua feel safe when even now the United States plans to hold joint military manoeuvres with Honduras on the Nicaraguan-Honduras border between January and June next year? We understand that at the end of those manoeuvres 25,000 troops would have participated in them. Quite apart from the inherently provocative nature of such manoeuvres, they pose the real danger of constituting actual material preparation for an eventual invasion of Nicaragua. These manoeuvres will entail the construction of roads, encampments, communication and supply links that will outlast the duration of the exercise itself. For those who may later wish to invade Nicaragua—*voilà*—the necessary infrastructure for invasion is already in place, put there with cunning simplicity under the very noses of the international community.

97. It is a pity that the original Contadora provision that proscribed all foreign military manoeuvres in Central America is to be flouted in this way. We also regard it as a matter of regret that that provision, which seemed so sound, so constructive, and aimed at increasing regional mutual confidence, should now be altered to mean not proscription but regulation of such manoeuvres. It is to be hoped that a sense of balance will be restored to all proposals for the settlement of the Central American crisis, especially in view of the fact that the original Contadora proposals, which Nicaragua, despite grave misgivings, had already accepted *in toto*, have again been brought to the table with yet some more amendments from the other party. We do not regard as unreasonable the Nicaraguan requirement that any future Contadora proposals should contain a demand that the United States stop its aggression against Nicaragua.

98. The position of my Government regarding the crisis in Central America has been remarkable for its consistency and is well known. We have always supported a negotiated settlement to the crisis, and we view with great alarm the recent escalation of the conflict in the region. We urge the parties concerned to resume the stalled Manzanillo bilateral talks, and we commend the Contadora Group for its tireless efforts to find a just and peaceful settlement which addresses the legitimate security interests of all parties concerned.

99. As a confidence-building measure we ask that all the parties adhere to the original Contadora provision that proscribes foreign military manoeuvres in this sensitive region. Finally, we would warn those whom an over-abundance of power has made arrogant—in the face of world opinion and the world's highest court—of the dangers of a decline in multilateralism. It is our belief that no nation on earth is so powerful that it can advocate the advent of an anarchical international régime in which there is a free-for-all. Power and affluence are best enjoyed in conditions of order, and it seems to us short-sighted that those very beneficiaries of the current world order should be the ones so enthusiastic about assailing some of its most fundamental underpinnings, such as the world court.

100. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now make a statement as the representative of BURKINA FASO.

101. The Security Council once again has before it a complaint by Nicaragua, by which it is asked to consider the extremely serious situation in that country. The situation in Central America, of which Nicaragua is a part, has been described here so often that there is nothing inherently new in regard to it, but the Council must give all the necessary attention to the recent developments placed before the Council by the representative of that country, the Acting Minister for External Relations. Nicaragua's request is fully justified by those developments, which testify to an escalation of tension in the region.

102. The Council has been informed of the use of ground-to-air SAM-7 missiles against a Nicaraguan helicopter. Above and beyond the heavy losses Nicaragua has suffered in human lives and property, my delegation is gravely concerned at that use. Indeed, in addition to the dangerous precedent it constitutes and the confusion it tends to sow, my delegation sees in this new turn of events a real threat to security in the subregion. The situation is therefore serious and calls for an appropriate stand to be taken by the Security Council. In order for it to do so, it must consider the situation in its global context, which is that of the crisis in which Central America finds itself embroiled.

103. My country's continuous and continually held position with regard to the crisis situation in Latin America in general is well known. The peoples of Latin America, who have always fought resolutely for the consolidation of their national independence and for full exercise of their sovereignty, are and must remain free to choose their own political, economic and social systems. The fact that they are being denied that inalienable right, *inter alia*, obviously contributes to the fact that the tension that prevails in Central America is now one of the major concerns at the international level.

104. Faced with that continually mounting tension, the international community has untiringly endeavoured to work out a negotiated political solution. Those efforts would certainly have borne fruit by now had it not been for external interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the subregion.

105. Deeply committed as it is to respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, Burkina Faso is and will always be against foreign interference in any form. It repudiates and firmly condemns the use or threat of force in relations among States.

106. The economic and political pressures being brought to bear against Nicaragua are unacceptable and have therefore been widely condemned by the international community. In addition to having contributed to a very great extent to the risk of a regional war, they have also undermined the necessary dialogue established by the Contadora Group to arrive at a negotiated political settlement of the region's problems. Furthermore, they are very clearly aimed at destabilizing Nicaragua and at overthrowing the revolutionary régime democratically chosen by that small State, which is a Member of the United Nations and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. In this connection I wish once again to reaffirm

my country's active solidarity with Nicaragua in its struggle against such pressures and oppression.

107. It is time that threats against Nicaragua cease; it is time to halt the hostile acts and the financing of groups of mercenaries. Let us reaffirm together here the sovereignty of Nicaragua and the other States of the region. Let us together unequivocally reaffirm the inalienable right of each and every one freely to choose a political, economic and social system and to pursue international relations in light of the clear interests of their people—without outside interference, without subversion or coercion, direct or indirect, and without threats of any kind whatsoever.

108. In so speaking I am sure that I am expressing Nicaragua's wishes and that I am expressing the legitimate hopes that country places in the Security Council. I am convinced that in making such a commitment every member will be serving not only Nicaragua but, beyond that State, also the cause of the other States in the region and, above all, the cause of international peace and security.

109. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT of the Council. The representative of the United States of America has asked to make a statement in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call upon him.

110. Mr. OKUN (United States of America): Some of the statements made in this body in the past few days, particularly those of Nicaragua, Cuba and Zimbabwe, made me try to recall what it was that brought us here in the first place. It is interesting to note that the most vociferous defenders of the Managua régime, in particular Viet Nam, Cuba and Iran, are charter members of the newest and, I regret to say, worst international organization, that of the organization of refugee-exporting countries—not OPEC, but OREC. Those countries, like Nicaragua, seek to crush all forms of domestic opposition and to deny their people the most basic of democratic electoral freedoms many of us take for granted. It is no wonder, therefore, that people vote with their feet and flee those lands, as they flee from Nicaragua.

111. The origins of these proceedings have become somewhat lost in the manoeuvres of the Government of Nicaragua. It seeks once again to use whatever pretext it can to divert attention from its obligation to negotiate seriously in the Contadora process. One of the cardinal tenets of that process is to take meaningful measures towards national reconciliation in Nicaragua. National reconciliation through dialogue is a fundamental principle of the Contadora process, which has, from the start, promoted a regional peace settlement. The principle was accepted by all five Central American nations.

112. The Contadora Act, which Nicaragua said it accepted without change, contains a section entitled "Commitments with regard to national reconciliation". Those commitments include, among others, the obligation of nations experiencing insurgencies to create mechanisms for dialogue with opposition groups. The agreements also provide that the commitments of the parties "are of a legal nature and are therefore binding" [*see S/17549, annex V, part III, para. 1*].

113. Let us also not forget that it is not just Nicaragua which has security concerns in Central America. Costa Rica, Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador all have legitimate concerns which must be taken into consideration in a comprehensive regional accord, concerns which revolve around Nicaragua's aggression against its neighbours and its destabilizing military buildup. Sifting through this obfuscation, it seems that we were called together to consider the issue of a missile fired on 2 December by elements of the Nicaraguan democratic opposition against a helicopter of Managua's armed forces.

114. The Nicaraguan representative attempted on 10 December [*2633rd meeting*] to spread the false statement that the United States had provided SAM-7 missiles to the Nicaraguan resistance forces. For the Nicaraguan delegation's peace of mind, let me repeat what Mr. Walters stated in that meeting: the United States has not provided these weapons to the Nicaraguan resistance.

115. This was not the first time that we made our position clear. The Nicaraguan chargé d'affaires in Washington was told by a representative of the Department of State on 6 December that the United States adamantly rejected the Nicaraguan charge that the United States was somehow responsible for the missile attack.

116. As we emphasized in our statement of 10 December, there is a war going on in Nicaragua. This war is being conducted by the current régime against its own people. This war is unlikely to end until the rulers in Managua stop trying to blame outside forces for the domestic opposition to their rule and, instead, come to terms with their own people. No amount of tortured rhetoric from the Nicaraguan delegation, or from any other delegation, can distract the international community from seeing that the refusal of Managua to embark on a dialogue with its own people remains at the heart of the Nicaraguan tragedy. The peaceful solution to this struggle lies in the Managua régime's acceptance of the March 1985 proposal of the Nicaraguan democratic resistance for a church-mediated dialogue, a cease-fire and suspension of the state of emergency. The sooner the *comandantes* realize this, the better off their people and their neighbours will be.

117. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

118. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I think this is the right context in which to reiterate the famous verse "We all take refuge in God from Satan the accursed".

119. I just cannot understand how the representative of the United States can seek to justify the criminal action his Government has been taking against Nicaragua by reference to what is happening in my country. What we do to our people may be right or wrong—that is, of course, not his business—but his reference to my country remains irrelevant when he ought to answer the many questions

put forward here regarding the actions and attitudes of the United States regarding Nicaragua.

120. What I said in my statement [*2634th meeting*] was very simple. I just reminded this very important international body of the fact that the United States did not recognize the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and the explanation for that. My explanation was that even if it did go to the Court it would know beforehand that its arguments would not sell for a penny. That is a fact. If it could convince the authorities of the International Court of Justice, does anyone think it would stand idle and be beaten because of that? Of course it would have done something.

121. Secondly, I think that the particular language used to comment on the internal affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran is too big for some mouths. I mention this particularly because we are not exporting refugees, we are hosting refugees. I am proud to say that we have at least 2 million Afghan refugees, we have more than half a million Iraqi refugees and we have been taking care of 2.5 million war-stricken people of our own country, who must be treated as refugees because their homes and properties have all been destroyed. To accuse us of the exportation of refugees is, I believe, too much of a claim; more thought is required before making such an accusation.

122. Furthermore, we know the United States of America is hosting many of the dissidents—not necessarily refugees—from the Islamic Republic of Iran who have stolen a great amount of our property. Those people have the support of the Government of the United States. Many representatives might have seen that fabulous, glamorous picture shown on television of the luxurious residence and the security measures the wife of the ex-Shah is enjoying in the United States. The wife of the ex-Shah is very well known in Iran, and we know how much property she inherited from her father. We also know that what she is enjoying here in the United States is the stolen property of the people of the Islamic Republic of Iran, for which the representative of the United States sheds his crocodile tears.

123. We believe that Hodjabr Yazdani, who has stolen $400-million-worth of our property—we have the bank record—is a refugee in this country and has the support of the Government of the United States. And he is not the only one. We do not think it is in the interests of the United States to criticize us. It should keep on with its talk about Nicaragua if it wants to be safe, for there are so many other things that could be revealed.

124. As a matter of fact, going back to the substance of what we said about Nicaragua, I do not know anybody who is not aware of the facts I mentioned. We believe that if the Contadora Group comes to a standstill, we shall have to thank the Government of the United States. If the people of Nicaragua are suffering from all kinds of blockades, economic restrictions and military threats, again we have to thank the Government of the United States. If missiles are downing helicopters that Nicaragua has bought for defensive purposes, again we have to thank the United States. If counter-revolutionary elements are causing trouble for the Government of Nicaragua, we have to appreciate the significance of the role of the United States. If the Somoza elements are being paid highly—probably more highly than the regular officers of the Nicaraguan Government—then again we have to thank the Government of the United States.

125. We believe that the Government of the United States must look to the United States and prepare a clean record. When its own record is clean, let it come to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

126. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Nicaragua who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

127. Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again I should like to say that my delegation has on various occasions, when it has felt compelled to come to the Security Council to denounce United States aggression, stated that there is a tendency, which has become a practice, for the United States delegation to try to distort the specific, genuine points made by my delegation with regard to our motives for coming to the Council, using for this purpose references to other countries and other regions or matters that relate to the domestic policy of my Government. Therefore, as we have already said, we shall not refer to the assertions he made either today or two days ago. However, we must say briefly that we are quite convinced that very few refugees leave the United States for other countries, because history has shown what United States Governments do to their opponents; they either murder them or put them in reservations, like the Indians, or in ghettos, like the blacks at present. There are no such practices in Nicaragua.

128. We should also like to state that a refrain is constantly repeated by representatives of the United States in this important organ, which should be respected because of the functions entrusted to it by the international community, to the effect that their Government has no intention of doing and is not doing anything to overthrow the legally constituted Government of Nicaragua; that it is not providing arms to the counter-revolution and the CIA mercenaries; and that it is not using the territory of Central American States to bring about the overthrow of my Government.

129. I would recall that, on a certain occasion, I said to Mrs. Kirkpatrick that her assertions on that occasion were products of ignorance of the policies and terroristic practices of her own Government. Unfortunately, since these were so often repeated, I can only say that there is no such ignorance; what we have is terroristic attempts to overthrow legitimately constituted Governments such as that of Nicaragua, and in that sense I do not need to say any more because the international community knows very well the different ways in which these attempts are daily being manifested and how these funds are being approved in the United States Congress.

130. We believe that it is of the highest importance for the Council to have discussed the complaint of Nicaragua on this occasion. We think this is the responsibility which

you all bear, namely, to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security and, in a preventive fashion, to consider situations which may arise in the future. We would like to say to the Council that it can remain absolutely assured that, inasmuch as United States aggression continues against our country, we shall continue to call on the patience of the members of the Council and ask it to convene to consider the gradual escalation of tension and aggression against my country.

131. For Nicaragua, unlike many countries, including the United States, the death of a Nicaraguan citizen or a murder by CIA terrorists is of great importance and, within the context of the current situation in the area, it raises some aspects which could provoke situations potentially dangerous to international peace and security. This is one of these occasions.

132. We shall desist from convening the Council only when the United States ceases its aggression. If there were no United States aggression, we would not have felt compelled at any time to have recourse to this organ, calling it into session to explain the violations of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of our country, which the United States Administration and the CIA are constantly committing.

133. I should like, at the same time, to thank all the delegations which have spoken in this debate, expressing their firm defence of the rule of law, their respect for international juridical order and the defence of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In this sense, we reiterate our profoundest thanks to all those, who were the vast majority—with the logical exception of the United States and one or two others—who so firmly and categorically expressed their concern about the situation in the area and about the constant aggression from which Nicaragua is suffering and who have expressed their solidarity with my country.

134. We are profoundly concerned at the escalation of tension in Central America. Our complaint in this important body is that the supply of SAM-7 or red-eye missiles to the mercenary troops of the CIA may constitute a situation which imperils not only civil aviation in the area but is also liable to aggravate an already serious situation and increase the possibility of an escalation and a conflagration of a regional nature in Central America.

135. We would express the hope that this concern of ours will be dispelled and in the future peace will become a reality. Unfortunately, the statements of the United States representative give us a glimpse into the future of the region—an uncertain future with regard to the possibility of a negotiated future in Central America.

136. We believe that it is of the highest importance for the United States, essentially, and also the Central American countries to turn from rhetoric and try to prevent any further aggression or a continuation of attempts on the part of the United States to overthrow my Government and that we should thus take serious concrete steps for a possible solution, a politically negotiated solution, to the current conflict in Central America and the aggression which is constantly going on against my country.

137. We would like to state that my country is a peace-loving country; we love peace, we want peace, we need peace. But we will never accept a peace imposed by force of arms. We will never, as is claimed by the President of the United States, give way, and he can be assured of that.

138. As we have said on previous occasions, and I should like to repeat this once again, our Government and our people want Central America to become in the future a zone of peace, a neutral zone, a zone free from any interference from outside and free of any foreign military presence. We are ready for and we are committed to the disappearance of military bases and training centres from any Central American country in which they may exist—including Nicaragua, if they existed there, and we are ready to say they do not; we are ready to see the disappearance of foreign military manoeuvres, or any transit or passage of foreign troops through Central American waters or lands; and we are ready to see the disappearance of any military advisers who may possibly exist in any of our countries. We are convinced that this is the only way of achieving peace in Central America. When Central America, as I said, becomes a zone of peace, a neutral zone, free from any kind of foreign military presence, Nicaragua repeats in this body its commitment to make this a reality in the future.

139. Also, I should like to repeat once again in the Council that we will never agree to disarm ourselves until there is a cessation of United States aggression. We are ready to defend ourselves to the bitter end, to the last drop of blood of our people, and we shall secure the necessary means to do this. When United States aggression ceases, we are ready to do this.

140. We think that the Central American countries will be in a position, because of our historic brotherhood, to understand us. We think the only obstacle to this understanding is the United States—that is all I can call it—which does not want our Central American peoples to express their political will. When it stops its aggression, when it ends its terroristic practices, at that time, there will be true peace in Central America. At that time Central America will become a neutral zone and all Central American countries—since the security, not just of Nicaragua, but of all the countries of Central America will be ensured—will be able fully to disarm ourselves, but not before then.

141. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council has thus reached the end of the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

NOTE

[1] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, vol. III, 89th meeting, para. 213.

Litho in United Nations, New York 000300 90-61439—August 1991—2,050